

VZCZCXRO1465  
OO RUEHDBU RUEHFL RUEHLA RUEHMRE RUEHROV RUEHSL RUEHSR  
DE RUEHC #6796/01 0550312  
ZNY CCCCC ZZH  
O P 240309Z FEB 10  
FM SECSTATE WASHDC  
TO RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 7758  
RUEHVEN/USMISSION USOSCE PRIORITY 7733  
INFO CONVENTIONAL ARMED FORCES IN EUROPE COLLECTIVE PRIORITY  
ORG FOR SECURITY CO OP IN EUR COLLECTIVE PRIORITY  
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY  
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY  
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY  
RHEFDIA/DIA WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY  
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY  
RUESDT/DTRA OSES DARMSTADT GE PRIORITY  
RHMFISS/HQ USCENCOM MACDILL AFB FL PRIORITY  
RHMFISS/CDR USEUCOM VAIHINGEN GE PRIORITY  
RHMFISS/CDRUSAREUR HEIDELBERG GE//POLAD// PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 03 STATE 016796

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: DECL: 08/25/10  
TAGS: [OSCE](#) [KCFE](#) [NATO](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#)  
SUBJECT: CFE/VCC: GUIDANCE FOR THE 25 FEBRUARY 2010 VCC  
AND EXPERTS MEETINGS AND THE USOSCE 2010 AIAM

REF: (A)AC/319-WP(2010)0003, (B)AC/319-N(2009) 0038-REV1  
(EXPERTS TASKING)

Classified by: Richard A. Davis, VCI/CCA Office Director  
for Reasons 1.4 (B) and (D).

11. (SBU) This is an action message. USNATO, see  
paragraphs 2-11; USOSCE see paragraph 6-9.

- - - - -  
OBJECTIVES  
- - - - -

12. (C) U.S. objectives for the February 25, 2010  
meetings of the NATO Verification Coordinating Committee  
(VCC) and VCC Experts are as follows:

-- To oppose any revision to Vienna Document 1999 (VD99)  
Implementation Coordination procedures that would  
subordinate national priorities and prerogatives to an  
automatic and formulaic mechanism for allocating  
verification activity quotas.

-- To agree to the remaining proposed edits included in  
Reference A with minor changes.

--To propose that the VCC discuss the Annual  
Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM) and ongoing VD99  
work in Vienna before tasking the VCC Experts to do any  
work related to VD99.

-- To announce to Allies Washington's intent to raise  
questions at the 2010 AIAM related to the fall 2009  
inspections in Belarus and Kazakhstan with the aim of  
discouraging the practice of a pS inspecting a country  
holding an exercise in which the inspecting pS is an  
exercise participant.

-- To encourage Allies to share information on potential  
notifiable military activities in the current calendar  
year that are of interest for the deconflicted VD99  
inspection schedule.

-- To update Allies on completed verification  
activities.

- - - - -  
Implementation Coordination  
- - - - -

¶3. (SBU) Washington has reviewed the IS draft revision (REF) to AC/319-D(2009)0001 and is generally content with the proposed edits, with the exception of those offered in paragraph 2. USDel should make clear that the U.S. opposes both proposals to paragraph 2, which both attempt to specify how Allies will resolve conflicts that arise during the coordination process. Washington's view is that the only acceptable solution to resolving conflicts encountered during the coordination process is through negotiation among the affected Allies. USDel may draw from the following during the meeting of VCC Experts:

-- Washington opposes both proposed revisions to paragraph 2, which advocate giving priority for allocation of verification activity quotas in high-interest countries to Allies based on how recently they have conducted like activities in the country in question.

-- The U.S. views any such mechanism or formula as prejudicial to individual national interests and prerogatives.

-- Allies have successfully negotiated solutions to all the coordination conflicts over the past two years and

STATE 00016796 002 OF 003

we see no reason to alter the process that has led to consensus while preserving individual Allies' rights and interests.

-- In this light, the U.S. would also note that, in our view, the phrase, "...taking into consideration alternative bids," as found at the end of paragraph 2 does not equate to an automatic forfeiture of an Ally's primary bid if its alternate bid is still available.

-- The remaining edits to Ref A are generally acceptable. The U.S. would prefer a review of the procedures in the spring and proposes deleting the word "summer" in para 11.

¶4. (SBU) USDel should also ask Allies to consider, for the purposes of clarity, reviewing the paper to correct minor grammatical errors and awkward constructions. USDel may suggest and accept such edits at the table as long as they do not change the substantive content of the paper. USDel should encourage Allies to share information about potential notifiable military activities in the current calendar year that could be of interest for the deconflicted VD99 inspection schedule.

- - - - -  
Experts Tasking on VD99  
- - - - -

¶5. (C/ REL NATO) On February 16, 2010 the International Staff (IS) issued under silence procedures a revision one to its tasker for Experts "...to review VD99 with the intent of identifying possible technical adjustments..." (Ref B). On February 23 the U.S. broke silence, noting its preference to continue a discussion on the proposed tasker within the 25 February VCC. USDel should draw from the following to explain the rationale for Washington's break.

-- In December, Ministers called on the FSC in 2010 to "explore ways in which to strengthen the OSCE's political-military toolbox, with particular attention to strengthening current arms control and CSBM instruments, including strengthening the Vienna Document 1999" (MC. DEC/16/09). In Vienna, a number of proposals are under consideration, including two proposals aimed at moving forward on improving VD99 that have been recently tabled

by Allies. In addition, we understand that Allies intend to table at the upcoming AIAM a number of proposals for improving VD99 that VCC Experts have discussed at great length in the past.

-- Washington sees value in exploring whether there is a way for the work of the VCC and its Experts to complement VD99 work already ongoing in Vienna. Thus, we are not in favor of an open-ended review of VD99 by the VCC Experts. We would welcome a discussion about how to maximize the ability of the VCC to make a positive contribution to VD99 discussions, but first must have a better understanding of the pace and scope of related work in Vienna.

- - -  
AIAM  
- - -

¶6. (C/REL NATO) Estonia and Portugal inspected Belarus the second and third weeks of March respectively. The Russian Federation conducted an inspection in Belarus during the first week of September that exhausted the last inspection quota in Belarus for 2009 as well as preceded the joint Russian-Belarus exercise, "West-2009," in which 12,529 personnel, including 6,820 from Belarus, 5,680 from Russia and 29 from Kazakhstan participated. In 2009, the Netherlands conducted a VD99 inspection in February and Germany conducted a VD99 inspection in August in Kazakhstan. Then, in October, Kyrgyzstan conducted an inspection in Kazakhstan, which coincided with the CSTO exercise "Interoperability-2009" and which exhausted the last quota in 2009 for Kazakhstan. In both the Russia and Kyrgyzstan cases,

STATE 00016796 003 OF 003

these inspections conducted by non-NATO states preempted planned Allied inspections of notified significant military activities. The U.S. is concerned that this unprecedented practice, if continued, will undermine the transparency that VD99 inspections are intended to provide.

¶7. (SBU) U.S. VCC Del should notify Allies in the VCC and/or VCC Experts meetings, drawing from the points in paragraph 9, as appropriate, of our intention to raise this issue for discussion at the upcoming Annual Implementation Assessment Meeting (AIAM) under Working Session 1. We also request that Allies planning to table papers or raise issues at the upcoming AIAM share such information. As always, we would welcome an exchange of views on papers that are going to be tabled at the AIAM.

¶8. (SBU) U.S. OSCE Del should coordinate in advance with Allies and draw from the points in paragraph eight to raise questions at the AIAM under working Session 1. Del should avoid criticism of individual pS and their past practices, focusing on broader themes of transparency and implementation.

¶9. (SBU) USDels may draw from the following as necessary:

-- The U.S. intends to raise at this year's AIAM the issue of pS conducting inspections in countries that host military activities in which the inspecting pS is a participant.

-- (For the VCC only) We are raising this issue in response to the inspections that Russia and Kyrgyzstan conducted last year in Belarus and Kazakhstan respectively.

-- In both cases, an OSCE pS conducted an inspection in a country in which it was a participant in a significant

military exercise that was notified in accordance with VD99. In both cases a pS involved in the exercise exhausted the last quota available and thus, precluded any other pS from inspecting the exercise.

-- We are interested in soliciting pS views and potential ways to avoid a repetition of this situation.

-- Our intent is not to criticize particular states, but to shed light on an implementation concern that has impacted transparency within the zone of application.

-- (For the VCC only) VCC coordination procedures were designed to permit Allies to revise the deconflicted schedule as appropriate. We encourage Allies to share information about potential and notifiable military activities in the current calendar year that could be of interest for the VD99 inspection schedule.

¶10. (C/REL NATO) The United States conducted a CFE flank supplementary inspection in Ukraine during timeblock 48 (8-14 February) and will report on the results of this inspection at the next VCC meeting in April.

¶11. (C/REL NATO) The United States would like to announce two changes to its CFE Schedule. The U.S. paid CFE inspection in Ukraine that currently is scheduled in timeblock 15 has been moved to timeblock 6 (19-25 April 2010) and the U.S. CFE inspection in Azerbaijan has been moved from timeblock 7 to timeblock 10 (17-23 May 2010). The Allies who have guest inspectors who are slated to participate in those inspections should be aware that the inspectors are still assigned to those inspections; only the timeblocks have changed.  
CLINTON